

An on-site Special Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 6:00 P.M. on Tuesday, March 26, 2002 at the proposed Troy Baptist P.U.D. site.

1. ROLL CALL – With Resolution To Excuse If Necessary

Present

Chamberlain  
Pennington  
Starr  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Waller

Absent

Littman  
Storrs  
Wright

RESOLUTION

Moved by Chamberlain

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that Mr. Littman, Mr. Storrs, and Mr. Wright be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yeas: All Present (6)

Absent: Littman  
Storrs  
Wright

MOTION CARRIED

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

2. A walkthrough of the proposed Troy Baptist P.U.D. was conducted by the Planning Commission and staff.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

4. ADJOURN

The walkthrough meeting concluded at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director

*Minutes for Special Study Meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on March 26, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall on following pages:*

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, March 26, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Chamberlain  
Reece  
Waller  
Kramer  
Starr  
Pennington (7:35)  
Storrs (7:35)

**Absent**

Wright  
Littman

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

2. MINUTES

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED to approve the February 5, 2002 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes as corrected.

**Yeas**

Chamberlain  
Kramer  
Starr  
Waller  
Reece  
Pennington  
Storrs

**Abstain**

**Absent**

Wright  
Littman

MOTION CARRIED

**RESOLUTION**

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED to approve the February 12, 2002 Planning Commission Special Study Meeting Minutes as corrected.

Yeas

Kramer

Starr

Waller

Reece

Pennington

Storrs

Abstain

Chamberlain

Absent

Wright

Littman

**MOTION CARRIED****RESOLUTION**

Moved by Reece

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that Mr. Littman and Mr. Wright be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yeas:

All Present (7)

Absent:

Littman

Wright

**MOTION CARRIED****STUDY ITEMS****3. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

Mr. Miller stated there was nothing to report.

**4. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REPORT**

Mr. Miller stated that on April 17, 2002, the Downtown Development Authority will be presenting the Civic Center Conference Center study that was presented to

City Council. INA USA, a research and development Firm, are submitting a site plan for a new facility next to Altair. CART Racing Organization is moving out of Troy to Indianapolis, Indiana and Franks Nursery has been talking with Doug Smith regarding their building vacancy.

Michigan Economic Development Corporation did a site visit on Wolverine Carbide. It was their 30,000 inspection. They go to different organizations to see if they can help them out. Also approved by the State, the Broadband Bill, that will change the way fees are charged for underground wiring and even above ground wiring. Ameritech will be included in the fee structure.

Mr. Kramer asked if any there is any idea who the tenants are next to WalMart.

Mr. Miller replied not at this time, however, but he could find out.

5. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REPORT

Ms. Pennington stated there was nothing to report.

6. PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD-1) – Proposed Troy Baptist Church/Robertson Brothers P.U.D., East side of Rochester and South of South Blvd., Section 2 – R-1D – No new information received.

Mr. Miller stated that City Staff continues to meet with the Robertson Brothers Co., Franklin Properties and Troy Baptist Church. The petitioner is designing a new project that may eliminate the office component and add some medium density residential on the Rochester Road frontage. Schematic plans are expected to be available in the near future.

Mr. Miller further stated at this point that City Management has met at least twice with Troy Baptist and Robertson Brothers. Tomorrow, March 27<sup>th</sup>, we are having a meeting at 11:30 a.m. and he believes some schematic plans will be presented. The general idea is leaning towards the office being eliminated. Residential will be closer to the Rochester Road frontage, although we still have not seen a plan. We do not have any new information available at this time.

Mr. Storrs asked what are the pink ribbons doing on those trees at the site.

Mr. Chamberlain stated they mean the trees are dead and they will be removed.

Petitioner, Jim Clark of Robertson Brothers, stated they will present a total of 3.8 units per acre under CR-1. They will not be requesting any variances with the exception of 50% attaching of common walls and private roads. We will accept any comments from the Commission.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that in walking the site this evening they noticed large groves of conifers and the commission believes these would be an amenity to the site and should be kept.

Mr. Storrs commented on retaining some of the wetlands.

Mr. Kramer asked when looking at the PUD or a modification, are we looking at the complete development plan. What will be the final layout plan. Will there be a Phase I and future phases. Will the development stop as presented. What happens if the wetlands status changes.

Mr. Clark stated that there would be contractual obligations to residents as to what would be developed and include E-P zoning. We are looking for a residential PUD. A blended PUD that will be owned by Robertson Brothers.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we are not going to design this right now.

7. & 8. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-586) – American Polish Cultural Center Expansion, Northwest Corner of Maple and Dequindre, Section 25.

SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-875) – Troy Professional Associates Office Building, North side of Maple and West of Dequindre, Section 25

Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Commission tabled the American Polish Cultural Center Expansion item at the March 12, 2002 meeting to the April 9, 2002 meeting. The petitioner submitted a site plan that the Planning Department and other City Staff are in the process of reviewing. A joint driveway is indicated and will be shared with the proposed Troy Professional Associates Office Building. The City has yet to finish a complete analysis of the site plans. Please note that the joint drive location appears to be awkward. The internal traffic circulation requires revisions to improve traffic flow and car stacking areas.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he presumed this was tabled from the last meeting and asked if the American Polish Cultural Center and the Troy Professional Associates Office Building were both represented at the last meeting.

Mr. Miller stated that the American Polish Cultural Center was, however the Troy Professional Associates Office Building was not.

Mr. Miller stated that what he has identified as a problem is the existing joint driveway and cross-access easement on the existing property. At one time the overall property was owned by the American Polish Cultural Center, but they are no longer owners of the overall property. The overall site is owned by the Cultural Center but they have sold off a portion to the Troy Professional Associates. We need to look at the possibility of coordinating the driveway with consideration

being given that there is an existing cross driveway and joint access easement, and also look at the aesthetics. Since that time we have met with both parties. The Cultural Center has concerns about the effects in the parking lot and their membership. There are some options that we are looking at. The petitioners need to look at this issue and deal with it. They have agreed to put in more open space. We just met with them last Friday. The major issue is how we can utilize a joint driveway to the office building and the Cultural Center. This situation is not perfect either because we have an existing parking lot which has parking in a joint driveway cross-access easement.

Mr. Miller further stated that in discussions with the Traffic Engineer, his preferable methods were options #1 and #2 that are marked in the corner of the four options presented. Option #1 includes a driveway with the access coming straight in the existing site. It is not really changing that much. The problem is you would have to turn again right after you first turned in. Option #2 relocates the old entrance driveway east to the office center on its existing boundary. The reason he noted those was because the Traffic Engineer saw those as best. The next design is where you put a median with the existing driveway for the Cultural Center and have a one-way in and then put a new driveway in, then have a driveway coming out; but he didn't think that's a perfect answer either. He admitted that none of these options are perfect. It should have been built correctly when it was originally built. The last option includes a single driveway with parking on either side. He didn't feel that's a great idea either. These are options we are just reviewing.

Mr. Waller asked if driveway #1 center line existed, if it is currently shared in that area and if it has already been striped. Would it be striped up the center.

Mr. Miller stated you would have to contain the traffic.

Mr. Waller stated that he likes #2.

Mr. Starr stated that it is wrong that someone pull in and immediately has to make a decision.

Mr. Miller stated that the Cultural Center's parking area is the parking area utilized by most of their regular members.

Mr. Chamberlain stated they would need to redo the cross-access easement. I have to agree with Option #2. It is the best of the options.

Mr. Chamberlain asked Mr. Miller if has ongoing discussions with the petitioners.

Mr. Miller stated we are going to meet to resolve this soon.

Ms. Pennington asked if storm detention was being taken into consideration.

Mr. Miller stated that as of now, nothing has occurred. They said they would fix it up, but not reconfiguring it.

Ms. Leslie Banus, Attorney for the American Polish Cultural Center stated there was one other possibility that Mr. Miller did not mention and that would be to have two different driveways. We are not adverse, we are aware of traffic concerns. We don't feel there is any compelling reason to change.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that our goal is to consolidate driveways. There are too many accidents with multiple driveways.

Mr. Reece stated that points are well made. The health, safety and welfare of our residents are at higher risk with two driveways.

Ms. Banus stated that she believes one driveway will not be good and is sorry to hear that the commission is taking this position.

Mr. Chamberlain stated one driveway for two sites. Get it in the most optimum place. The bottom line is there is going to be only one driveway between the two sites.

Ms. Banus stated that the cross-access easement is in the wrong place.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that land uses change. The Planning Commission will not buy into two driveways. Come up with a plan for a joint driveway.

Mr. Stanley Grot, 11927 Hiawatha, President of the American Polish Cultural Center, stated that the office is owned by doctors. We are willing to work out some sort of resolution although we do not have a lot of money to work with. We are a non-profit organization.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the parking has to be removed.

Mr. Grot stated we have room for parking. It is a safety issue for the center. People cut through our parking lot all the time.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that is against the law.

Mr. Reece stated an alternative would be is to make the connection as indirect as possible. We could work something out.

Mr. Chamberlain stated you need to work something out together with the other petitioner and figure out what's best for both of you and the City for one driveway.



Mr. Kramer stated that these are two (2) different parcels; these are two different plans. The petitioner could go forward without us. There would be little reason for us to consider if we approve this plan.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that may be right, but there will only be a single drive. Just sit down and resolve the easement.

Mr. Kramer stated that's the point. The single drive ends up being a single drive.

Mr. Grot stated that they want to work with the City, not against it. We are all residents of Troy.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that even if we were to approve it tonight, there would still be only one driveway.

Mr. Reece stated we can't design it tonight. The Planning Department could provide a list of driveways in the City to the petitioners. There are examples in the City that would help. There is the possibility of a very pleasing way to figure this out.

Dr. Teresa Jaszczak, petitioner for the office building, stated that they will be in the building on the west side of the American Polish Cultural Center. She asked the Planning Commission to show her their driveway because she didn't understand.

9. PROPOSED REZONING (Z-679) – Proposed Walnut Forest Condominium, East side of I-75, North of Paragon and South of the South end of Hedgewood Dr., Section 16 – R-1B to CR-1.

Mr. Miller stated that the Planning Commission tabled the subject rezoning request at the March 12, 2002 meeting to the April 9, 2002 meeting. It was requested that the petitioner provide a traditional one family subdivision or site condominium layout. This was requested by the Planning Department, however, the petitioner did not submit the schematic design for a traditional neighborhood as of the current date. If the petitioner does not prepare the requested information, the Planning Department will prepare a schematic plat for the April 9, 2002 meeting. There is no additional information available at this time.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if that was why we were holding another public hearing on this.

Mr. Miller stated that the Clerk recommended doing it.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we continue public hearings all the time and we don't advertise.

Mr. Miller stated that the City Clerk said that anytime it comes back to the Planning Commission it should be advertised.

Ms. Lancaster stated that there were quite a few members present at the last meeting, however, there is no problem advertising a public hearing again.

Mr. Waller stated that he went down and drove around some of the streets, and that some have sidewalks and some don't. I can't imagine we would allow access from Walnut Forest to Paragon. The berm is on private land. A breakaway gate would be advised to Paragon for emergencies.

Mr. Chamberlain asked when will we see the alternate plan.

Mr. Waller stated that we are requesting a single family layout. Is it a requirement of the ordinance that it be provided or is it requested that it be provided. Is it a request from the Planning Commission that it be detailed on what the configuration really would look like. The ordinance in CR-1 requires an alternative plan to show what a non-traditional cluster would look like. If it is being rezoned because it is a difficult parcel, then the parcel should prove that it cannot be built traditionally.

Mr. Miller stated that he has not received any information from the petitioner.

#### 10. ORDINANCE REVISION DISCUSSION

##### Stormwater Detention Basin Slope & Fencing

Mr. Chamberlain stated that Mr. Storrs had an action item to mark up the development standards for detention basins to eliminate the fenced detention option and that each member has been provided a copy of the markup which is the basis for today's discussions.

Mr. Chamberlain also asked what is the process for revising detention basin standards.

Ms. Lancaster stated that she has never heard of the Planning Commission revising engineering standards. It should be sent to Engineering.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the City Engineer has not shown up for two meetings now. We have given him the opportunity to review.

Ms. Lancaster stated she never heard of the Planning Commission adopting a Development Standard.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we are just making a recommendation to Council.

Ms. Lancaster stated that there should be a public hearing on it.

Mr. Miller stated that technically, it is not an Ordinance, it is a Standard.

Ms. Lancaster stated that all engineers would have to abide.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he wanted a public hearing scheduled as soon as possible.

Mr. Starr commented on the water quality issue and stated that we have got to deal with the water in the parking lots.

Mr. Reece stated that if we make this change, we are changing the City's requirements that we are no longer allowing fenced detention. We are making a recommendation to City Council on an area (Development Standards) that we have no responsibility.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we get into this when we are approving site plans and we beat up the developer.

Mr. Reece stated we are testing for clarification.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he has a right to petition City Council at any time.

Mr. Reece commented on parking lot detention and polluted detentions, and that the water should be filtered. It seems the most appropriate.

Mr. Waller stated that if someone wants to put in underground detention, we shouldn't hold them back on it. He didn't think we should take it off the list of possibilities. There may be room for improvement.

Mr. Reece stated that stormwater collects pollutants and it should be filtered.

Mr. Kramer stated we should not be advising on stormwater standards. If we start putting standards in place, this would be way out of line. He would shy away from a standard that's all inclusive.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that this recommendation only deals with fencing and slope.

Mr. Storrs stated I only got rid of the fenced detention option and that no revision to stormwater detention quantity had been made although he believes that a significant increase in the requirements should be made.

Mr. Keoleian stated, that in general, these are issues that concern us. We would definitely have a say on fencing and sloping.

Mr. Chamberlain agreed.

Mr. Storrs stated he wanted to point out that he wasn't proposing any filtering.

Mr. Chamberlain stated to the commission members to work with Mr. Storrs. Get rid of fences and deep slopes. Schedule a public hearing at our next meeting.

Mr. Miller stated we should follow our normal standard. It's just a recommendation on a standard.

Ms. Lancaster stated there is no state statute.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that when we get done approving this, we are not just going to send it up to Council, we are going to sit down and write a rationale for each one of them.

Mr. Miller stated that detention should be an amenity.

Mr. Kramer stated that there is a problem with limiting it to over surface. Change it to naturally treated stormwater detention. Don't want to tie up the engineers' hands, eliminate 2a.

Mr. Chamberlain commented on tying the engineers' hands for the city and how they have allowed chain link fencing and how trashy they have gotten. It is time for us just to move on.

Mr. Kramer asked what do we gain by open surface.

Mr. Storrs stated that Mr. Kramer had a good point and that if we are going to allow underground stormwater detention it should be added to the development standards.

Mr. Miller stated that it is a standard practice using video tape and fiber optics to check it. It is a formal process.

Mr. Storrs stated that it is a much more demanding inspection in both time and equipment to inspect underground detention systems.

Ms. Lancaster stated that if you stuck in an open end paragraph, then the city engineer could then maybe cover those open end paragraphs.

Mr. Starr asked how would underground storage fail.

Mr. Miller stated it would silt up.

Mr. Kramer stated that south of 12 Mile Road, they are using oversize piping as a method of storage. I don't think we should eliminate these options.

Mr. Waller agreed.

Mr. Reece stated that in Seattle their underground storage collapsed.

Mr. Storrs stated that in 2a you can take "Open Surface" out.

Mr. Chamberlain stated delete 2a.

Mr. Reece stated that there have been two attempts to get with engineering staff. We need to have some dialog with the staff and department.

Mr. Chamberlain stated they are just delaying us.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Storrs

Seconded by Kramer

RESOLVED that a Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 8, 2002, per Mr. Storrs' notes dated March 18, 2002, regarding revisions to Development Standards, Section E, i.e., detention basins, and other proposed changes.

### Yeas

All Present (7)

### Nays

### Absent

Wright

Littman

## MOTION CARRIED

### Fence & Walls

Mr. Kramer stated he will provide current revisions by e-mail to Mark Miller and that his intent will be a pillar type of wall. We are not going to be forcing one type or another. He also stated he will miss the next meeting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we are trying to save the trees and preserve water flow, grades and tree preservation. He stated we need to get away from killing trees just to install a wall.

## 11. SMALL / "IN FILL" RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Miller stated, this study meeting is the kick-off for the study of this problem. Both the Planning Commission and Planning Department observed at least two issues related to this problem. First, development of R-1T one family attached condominiums along major thoroughfares create individual pods of condominiums. This trend will permit the construction of numerous small developments, each with driveway access to major thoroughfares and no pedestrian or vehicle interconnection. Second, infill development of one family residential subdivisions or site condominiums adjacent to existing homes creates challenges for road interconnection and impact on the existing homes.

Mr. Miller further stated that what we need to do is decide what specific direction we want to go in. What we want to create and give staff direction and then staff will bring it back. We need to get the Planning Commission's input to find a way to improve these projects.

Mr. Chamberlain stated he's looking for guidance.

Mr. Starr commented on interconnection is also a real problem. In many cases, these are private roads. He believes they are part of the neighborhood. Interconnections with the existing subdivisions seems the point. We should have been collecting traffic data all along. Are we really putting more traffic flow through the subdivisions.

Mr. Keoleian stated that pedestrian interconnection sidewalks are first, vehicular access is second. He also asked if walls always have to be around condominium complexes. Walls block development from society.

Mr. Miller stated they are required for parking.

Mr. Reece stated that the health, safety, and welfare of the community has been in hand for a number of years and that we have become very weak in that department. There are too many curb cuts and the vehicular interconnection is missing. Then for years, we have worked on compatibility with the surrounding areas so there are not little gated pods around the community.

Mr. Storrs stated that he was not so sure it was all wrong. If people want to live like that, why not. If we really don't like the little forts, we could go with some kind of acreage requirement.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we see 2 or 3 forts in a row.

Ms. Pennington stated that it is exactly as Mr. Storrs stated. The Master Plan shows we want residential. We are going to have developers come in with condominiums. I don't think we are going to be able to stop this.

Mr. Kramer stated that for the benefit of the residents of these developers, that we should have the developer present a plan that includes a snow removal plan and a pedestrian plan. We should take a look at parking standards. These little plans need to be looked at, even if they are fenced. The setbacks to the existing adjacent land uses should be equal.

Mr. Waller stated that condominium projects on Long Lake Road, Harrington Estates and Charleston Club, should not get any City improvements until snow is taken away. Pedestrian access is the most important. Vehicular access next. No more City improvements until curbs and sidewalks are put in for the safety of kids. One way to begin solving this problem is putting in real streets and sidewalks.

Mr. Schultz, 883 Kirts, totally disagrees with prohibition of condominium walls around the complexes. People that live in \$200,000 houses seem to think that the \$300,000 condominium is going to detract from their property value. Walls limit visibility from the condo. High walls give you some screening, privacy, and buffers out noise. He doesn't care what the Master Plan says, Rochester Road shouldn't be residential. The City grants private road agreements for condos but you have to connect private road A to private road B to private road C. There is potential financial impact to condo associations and they are individual non-profit corporations and he thinks interconnecting is going to cause problems down the road. I am not sure the people that are attempting to force interconnection have sufficient understanding of the condo law.

Mr. Chamberlain asked for clarification of interconnection for pedestrians and vehicles.

Mr. Schultz stated he thinks you're talking about liability. These developers all go in on major thoroughfares.

Mr. Chamberlain commented on top priority:

1. Pedestrian interconnection plan.
2. Equal setback distance to adjacent land uses.
3. Vehicular interconnection, joint drive sliding scale based on size.
4. Snow removal
5. Guest parking

Mr. Waller stated a sliding scale is a good idea.

Mr. Kramer commented on a Rochester Road property that is a 10 acre parcel. The ownership is now two 5 acre parcels and we have 2 entrances on Rochester Road. If it was commercial, we would have insisted on cross-access easement.

Mr. Chamberlain stated frontage road would be on their side of the berm.

Mr. Kramer stated we don't want to be that specific.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that if there was some highway bible that existed that stated everything you wanted in the world was great and good, these are how far apart these driveways should be.

Mr. Chamberlain further stated that pretty much if you know what our front footage is on major roads in R-1T, one acre or ten acre, they would get you in that standard. Go back to your highway standard and approve only the kind we would like.

Mr. Miller asked why can't we encourage joint driveways.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that is what we are asking you to solve.

Ms. Pennington asked if we're in favor of sliding scales on vehicular issue. She personally doesn't like cross-access in condos. It is hard to enforce and she doesn't agree.

Mr. Storrs stated that with this standard for driveway separation, on 75% or less of the standard, the developer could be required to provide cross access, could be an approach.

Mr. Reece stated a sliding scale for joint drives is necessary for all, regardless of size. We keep doing the condos and we need pedestrian planning.

Mr. Starr stated that a sliding scale makes sense but what about existing conditions. Cross-access isn't going to go anywhere. If there is vacant property on the end site, potential is that cross-access would be useful; then I would want to take advantage of it.

Mr. Schultz commented on a 30 year old complex which needed to add more guest parking and vehicular cross-access, also, that West Oaks was not required to provide public road interconnection.

Mr. Miller commented that in talking about forcing private roads to connect to stub streets was with the idea of it interconnecting with other projects. We need to encourage different ways to reduce driveways and how we can encourage consolidation of the driveway. If you go to interconnection, they have to be public streets not private streets.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we have given Mr. Miller a good start and that he should report back to us in May. Would like to know where we are at.

Mr. Kramer commented on updating R-1T developments, Harrington Estates and Charleston Club.



Mr. Chamberlain stated that during this discussion, Mr. Waller and Mr. Kramer asked about pedestrian access. That doesn't exist. What's the answer.

Mr. Miller stated the developer installed the wall with joints so he can knock it out. He doesn't have the authority to have it removed.

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Kramer

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that the Planning Department, under the auspice of the Planning Commission, request the City take action to enforce the Harrington Estates and Charleston Club site plan provisions to have the cross-access pedestrian walkway installed immediately.

Yeas

All Present (7)

Nays

Absent

Wright

Littman

## MOTION CARRIED

### 12. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public hearing opened.

Mr. Schultz, stated that when the Planning Commission approves a site plan there is a Landscape greenbelt along the roads. He drove by Spectadium and all the 25 foot confers in front of that building were cut down. He talked to Ron Hynd from Parks and Recreation and he stated they were interfering with sight lines and that he gave them approval to cut them down.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we approve site plans and the Parks and Recreation Department approves landscape plans, then that landscape plan becomes a part of our approval plan.

Mr. Miller stated that Parks and Recreation has full authority on landscape standards.

Mr. Chamberlain commented on Tadian Condos. Who is forcing him to replace his trees three times. Who screams the loudest gets what they want.

Public comments closed.

FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER

Mr. Reece commented on Squirrel and Auburn Roads and stated that the brick pavers and planter boxes are just beautiful. He also commented on the Troy Baptist PUD and that it is not a total site. Somehow it was suppose to all mesh together.

Mr. Starr commented on the traffic count inside the subdivision and asked what effect it will have when you put in another subdivision. Transfer of rights, and the overlay districts need to be looked at.

Ms. Lancaster stated that the Rabbani case got adjourned until May 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Miller stated that another unfair problem we need to talk about in the future is vacant residential single family.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we are probably going to see what he's talking about because on John R. just north of the high school, there are two homes that front John R. that are for sale side by side.

Mr. Miller stated he has finished the process of interviewing for the principal planner position.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how long before the principal planner position would be filled.

Mr. Miller stated probably mid May.

Mr. Miller commented that we should go out and visit sites more often.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the next one we should visit as a group is the Big Beaver Land Use and Zoning Study.

Ms. Pennington stated she has a problem with the Engineering Department not responding to our request.

Mr. Kramer stated we should look at the Mid-Town detention basin. It is a good example. It is the most beautiful thing in the world at Big Beaver and Coolidge.

Mr. Waller stated that he approached the City for sidewalks along Maplelawn and it was denied. People are walking along Maplelawn all the time. The City needs to do something. The City has the responsibility of installing sidewalks from Maplelawn to Coolidge.

Mr. Waller further stated that he made a request asking the City to allow him to go to American Planning Association Annual Conference in Chicago. Mr. Miller sent

a letter to me stating that his request was not approved because it was out-of-state travel.

## RESOLUTION

The Chair moves that in order for the City of Troy to be represented at the American Planning Association Annual Conference in Chicago, Illinois, April 13 through April 17, 2002, it is the consensus of the Planning Commission that in lieu of Mark F. Miller who is unable to attend, that David Waller attend the conference as the City of Troy's representative.

Moved by Chamberlain

Seconded by Pennington

Yeas

All Present (7)

Nays

Absent

Littman  
Wright

## MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Chamberlain commented on the new law passed in January on Master Plans and asked if ours got in under the wire.

Mr. Miller stated yes.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we are okay then and that it doesn't need to be reviewed for five (5) years.

Mr. Chamberlain also asked where do we stand on the Crooks, Big Beaver thing. We targeted May with the Downtown Development Authority on an update.

Mr. Miller stated that we are working on that. It is  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  done.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that May is a good time to go to the Downtown Development Authority and commented to Mr. Miller to furnish the data to him for presentation.

Mr. Waller stated he has input from the Road Commission that the City of Troy placed 70<sup>th</sup> for the Big Beaver and Crooks area as having the highest accident rate in the state.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that discussions had been held with City Management to review all ordinances in the City and that there has been \$200,000 budgeted for that. I suggest that in order to better help out Mr. Miller, more people should be utilized. Find out how much of that budget we can use so we can get this done in a timely manner.

13. Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director